

Hansen	McCollum	Talent
Houghton	McIntosh	Thompson (MS)
Jones (OH)	Miller (FL)	Turner
Lazio	Oxley	Wise
Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez	
Lipinski	Shays	

□ 1413

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 637 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 637

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1415

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 637 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.J. Res. 114, a resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001. H.J. Res. 637 provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, the current continuing resolution expires at the end of the day and a further continuing resolution is necessary to keep the government operating while Congress completes consideration of the remaining appropriations bills.

H.J. Res. 114 is a clean continuing resolution that simply extends the provisions included in H.J. Res. 109 through October 25.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, it takes a lot of hard work and tough

decision-making to fund the Federal Government. While I share the regret of many of my colleagues that the negotiations have stretched on this long, we are now very close to completing the appropriations process. We have successfully resolved many of the hurdles in our path with hours of hard work. As we enter the final stretch, we remain dedicated to passing sensible and fiscally responsible appropriations bills. I am confident that this fair, clean and continuing resolution will give us the time we need to fulfill our obligations to the American people and complete the appropriations process in an even-handed and conscientious manner.

This rule was unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules on yesterday. I urge my colleagues to support it so we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I thank my colleague and my dear friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. This is the fourth continuing resolution to come before the House this year. Apparently number three was not the lucky charm. This is the fourth time that we have had to extend the appropriations deadline and this time through October 25, because my Republican colleagues just have not finished their work; and I do not think it is going to be the last time.

Despite the promises to finish all 13 appropriation bills on time, my Republican colleagues are still very far behind.

Mr. Speaker, from where I sit, the end is not even in sight. Each time we pass another continuing resolution, we grant another reprieve. Congress goes back in a recess. We all go back to our districts and nothing gets done here in Washington. So I think enough is enough. I think we should do shorter continuing resolutions. We should get the appropriation bills finished. These week-long continuing resolutions are not working. Congress should stay here and work.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment only 3 of the 13 appropriation bills have been signed into law. The rest are awaiting action either by the House or the Senate or by both. My Republican colleagues could have finished the appropriations bills by now. They could have approved education. They could have done a lot more but they just did not.

Despite the pressing needs for more classrooms, more teachers, repairs to our schools, my Republican colleagues continue to put education on the back burner.

So I think it is time for my Republican colleagues to get down to work. I think it is time our Republican colleagues make education a priority and put American children before the pow-

erful special interests. Democrats want to stay in Washington and strengthen the American public school system. Democrats want to fund school modernization and construction, and we also want to hire new teachers and reduce class size. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not think Congress should head back home when so much important work is left undone. If we have time to move the appropriations deadline again, we really have time for America's children. So I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question in order to get the work done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, said, here we go again. For the fourth time this month, the Congress is considering a resolution to temporarily fund the government. Now, Republicans claim that they are working very hard to get these appropriations bills passed, but the American people should know that today is our only full day of work in the Congress this week. The Republicans will send us home tonight, and we will not be back again until next Tuesday night. And I think the Republicans should be embarrassed. They simply cannot govern. Keep in mind that between today and next Tuesday, the Republicans are deploying their members to go out and campaign. They are not hunkered down in some room trying to figure out the appropriations bills. No, they are going out to fund-raisers and political events rather than doing the work that they were elected and paid to do.

Bowing to the will of special interests, Republicans have stopped their work on HMO reform, on prescription drugs, on gun safety, on education. They simply cannot get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention the education issue in particular today, because that is one of the ones that is supposedly going to be addressed in an appropriations bill next week; but so far the Republicans have been unwilling to bring up the Democratic initiative, which says two things. One, that we want to send more money back to the local school districts around the country so that they can hire more teachers and reduce class size. We know that smaller class sizes are great for discipline, great for a learning experience. But, no, the Republicans do not want to do that. They do not want to provide the money.

The second education initiative the Democrats have stressed is that they want to provide some funding back to the local school districts to help defray the costs of school modernization. We know that many schools are falling apart. They need renovation. Some

need to be upgraded for computers, for the Internet. Many times there is overcrowding, and new schools need to be built. Well, the Democrats have been saying and the President and Vice President GORE have been saying let us provide some money back to the towns, back to the local school districts to accomplish that goal but, no, the Republicans do not want to do that.

Basically, they are saying that these are not important. We should not provide money to reduce class size, to hire more teachers, to provide for school modernization. Democrats are saying, let us stay here and get the job done. We are not going to leave until the job is done and those two education initiatives are passed.

Let me mention some of the other issues. Prescription drugs, Governor Bush, the Republican candidate for President, said the other day that he was very concerned and wanted to provide some sort of benefit of prescription drugs, but I do not see it happening here. The Democrats have been saying they want a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Put it up. Let us vote on it. Same thing with HMO reform. We passed a good HMO reform bill here, the Norwood-Dingell bill, the Patients' Bill of Rights. It went over to the Senate and it died there. It died in conference. The conference has not even met. I am a member. I am one of the conferees. The conference has not met in several months. These are the kinds of things that the American people want done. They want HMO reform. They want the Patients' Bill of Rights. They want a Medicare prescription drug benefit. They want to do something about education.

What is more important to this country than good public schools? But we do not see any action on these things. We do not see any action. We say, go home. Come here one day. We will pass another continuing resolution, keep the government going for another 5 days or so. I have said before and I will say again, I am not going to support these long-term continuing resolutions for 5 days or a week. We should not allow continuing resolutions for more than one day at a time because we need to force the Republican leadership to get the job done. That is what they came down here for. We should insist and all should insist on staying here through the weekend every day until these appropriation bills are passed.

There are 13 appropriation bills that make up the budget effectively, and only three have been signed. The rest are still languishing here. Some of them are moving now but not enough, certainly not enough for us to go home for the weekend until next Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, let me say the Republican majority seems to be good at doing only one thing, and that is going home. Well, then the American people should send them home for good this November.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution really should not be approved, and it should not be approved because it is not going to allow us to get the work of this country done in this Congress because it simply postpones the date at which we are going to be held responsible for getting that work done.

I would hope the President does not grant this continuing resolution because a continuing resolution should only be granted so we can get our work done. This continuing resolution is being granted and then everybody is going to go home. Everybody is going to leave here tonight and come back Wednesday, and the continuing resolution runs until Wednesday.

Now we have heard weekend after weekend how the Republicans are going to stay here and work, but nothing happens. No meetings take place. Nobody works. No progress is made, and I think it is time to say enough is enough. The President ought to give us a continuing resolution until Monday and we ought to stay here tomorrow and Saturday and Sunday and get the people's business done.

There is a great deal at stake here. There is a great deal of concern in this country; and we have expressed it on both sides of the aisle, about our education system, about the resources that are necessary for our education system. We strongly believe certainly on this side of the aisle that we ought to increase the expenditures for special education. We ought to increase the expenditures for school construction, for modernization; and we ought to get on with it. We ought to get it done because this is what the people want for their children.

We ought to make sure that clearly the funds are in place for teacher quality, to lower class size, and supposedly both sides of the aisle are for that, except it just is not being done. The President has asked us now, point blank, to get it done and yet we find out that the meetings are not taking place; that the Republican leadership in the Senate and in the House are not coming together to present that plan and that proposal.

So what do we see? We drag on day after day, week after week, and the continuing resolution now, instead of forcing us to get things done, becomes an excuse for which we do not get things done, and meetings do not take place.

So I think we would be much more honest to the people we represent and to the people who are concerned with these issues in the country if we would shorten this continuing resolution; if in fact we would require people to stay here and work. Maybe we ought to go back to open conference committees where people are held accountable for the work product of those committees. I know that this extends in other areas,

but I have worked very hard on some of these education bills. We have talked about the help that we can give to many districts that need additional financial assistance for special education, and yet we see that that is bogged down. That cannot be that difficult to resolve, these education issues and to resolve them on behalf of America's families, on behalf of America's children and our local schools.

They need these resources to do the job. They should be given these resources to do the job, and we should do it now.

I would hope that later on when we are asked to vote on the continuing resolutions that people would reject this, and we would get on with a continuing resolution that puts some pressure on the Congress to get done with the people's business and to resolve these issues on health care.

I do not know if we have run out of time, but I would also hope that we could address the problems of prescription drug benefits, that we could address the problems of a Patients' Bill of Rights, that we could address the problems of the minimum wage for millions of workers who need additional financial resources to hold their families together, to provide, hopefully, themselves with the wherewithal to buy some kind of health care policy.

□ 1430

But these are people who are going to work every day, they are working hard, and, at the end of the year, they end up poor. They end up without health care, they end up without decent housing, they end up without decent educational opportunities for their children, and we ought to raise the minimum wage. But we ought to do it now, and we should not continue to provide excuses another 4 days, another 5 days, another 6 days, when everybody just goes home, they hold fund-raising events, they go campaign, they go to golf tournaments, they do all the rest of it. They just forget to do the people's business. And that ought to stop, and we ought to stop that now by defeating this continuing resolution, and maybe give us the continuing resolution to finish this weekend and get the people's work done and go home.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that the use of personal electronic equipment in the Chamber of the House is prohibited under the rules of the House, and Members are to disable wireless telephones on the floor of the House.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address why this CR, this continuing resolution, is

necessary. What it does is it allows our government to keep functioning. Now, there are those who do not want one. That would mean the government shuts down. I do not know if they have quite thought that through, but we do not want the government to shut down.

Now, why is the budget not signed? There are a couple of reasons that we think this is necessary to do today. Number one, we are at the point in the budget where the leadership on the Committee on Appropriations is working directly with the White House.

Now, the President has been out of town. The President has been in the Middle East. I think it is important for the President to be in the Middle East. I think it is important for America to be doing what America has been doing in the Middle East, to try to get Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Barak together, because what is going on in the Middle East is not just about the Middle East, it is about the whole globe; and I respect the President for dedicating the time that he has to try to resolve that. But obviously the President cannot negotiate the budget and the appropriations bills when he is out of town, so we are having to wait.

Now, the President is in town today, but then again tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, he will be at the funeral of his friend, the Governor of Missouri. Many of our Members, Republican and Democrat, including the distinguished Democrat leader, will be there for that important funeral of a very important, well-respected national figure. So there are a lot of Members of Congress who are going to be in Missouri tomorrow. We respect that. That is a bipartisan thing.

But during that period of time, there will still be a crew here negotiating on the budget, a crew here talking. There will be people working through the weekend, and that is what the leaders on the Committee on Appropriations and the leadership in the House have been doing and will continue to do.

So all of this finger pointing, that we are in this situation because somebody has done something wrong, I guess that is what George Bush was talking about the other day when he said it is time to get some people together who have a can-do attitude in Washington, who want to solve problems, who will reach out to the other side, reaching out to the Senate and the White House.

I do not think the American people want to hear all this partisan sniping today. The Members on the other side know that we passed the majority of the Committee on Appropriations bills, I think 12 out of 13, before we left town for the August work period, and we feel good that those were passed.

But this is a bicameral process, there are three branches of government; and just because the House passes the bill does not mean it ends there. It goes to the Senate, and the Senate has different visions and different ideas. Then we know also in order to have the White House sign it, they have their

own visions and ideas. So we are in this very complicated process of resolving a \$1.8 trillion budget for a country of 275 million people, and it should not surprise anybody that it takes a long time.

What is it that the House Republicans are trying to do? What is our vision? Well, our vision is simple. We want to pay our obligations first for Social Security. It was the House Committee on Appropriations that said we are going to quit using the Social Security trust fund for general operating expenses. After all, no business in America can mix its pension plan with its operating expenses. Who would do that? Who, but the U.S. Congress? Four years ago we stopped that process, and that has been one of our highest priorities.

Our second priority, of course, has been to protect and preserve the insurance policy for our seniors, the Medicare program, and we have done that. You will remember that 3 or 4 years ago the bipartisan Medicare trustees appointed by the President said it is going bankrupt if we do not act to preserve and protect it. We did, and now Medicare is on more solid footing.

This year our budget called for a prescription drug benefit for American seniors; not one that would insure Ross Perot and Bill Gates and other people who do not need the benefit, but targeting those who are in the most economic need of a prescription drug benefit. We have done that. We had a program that gave our seniors choices, not a universal required mandatory plan, and yet that was not passed by the Senate.

Well, again, that is what bicameral legislation is about. We are going to continue working on that.

I am happy to say that this House Committee on Appropriations in the agriculture bill did do something very significant to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, and that is the Drug Reimportation Act. The Drug Reimportation Act allows our seniors to buy lower-cost American manufactured drugs in other countries, such as Canada and Mexico, and take advantage of savings that they can get in those countries that they are not able to get right now, because, if they do, the Clinton-Gore FDA says no, you cannot go to Canada and buy your Zocor.

But I will tell you the case of a woman in our office, Myrlene Free. Her sister is on Zocor. If she buys it in Texas, it is \$97; but if she goes to Mexico, it is \$29. Now, this Republican Congress reached out to people like her and said we want you to be able to do that, and we put some language in the agriculture appropriation bill to allow that.

But, better than that, we said this is great news for people in boarder States, but what about the interior States? We are going to let them do it through the Internet, and also let their neighborhood pharmacist reimport drugs. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker,

these are American-made and American-manufactured drugs, the same dosage as they are already taking, and at as much as a 40 to 50 percent savings. That not only helps millions of American seniors, but millions and millions of young mothers raising kids.

I have four children. I know how expensive it is to keep a family in good health, and prescription drugs is part of our budget. This bill will bring down the cost of it. Now, we did get an agreement with the Senate on this, we do have an agreement with the President on this, and I think that has been worth fighting for. I think it has been worth the negotiating process.

There are other issues out there, such as trade opportunities for our farmers with Cuba. That is still out there.

Then we are going to be debating what to do about funding international abortion agencies. Mr. Speaker, that is always a controversial issue, and it is a bipartisan issue. You have pro-lifers and pro-choicers on both sides of the aisle. But this takes time.

We have another amendment out there that deals with the situation in Yugoslavia. Should we withhold funds from Serbia? Should we withhold funds from Montenegro because they are having elections out there that have turned out on a positive note right at this point? We want to support Mr. Kostunica; but, on the same hand, what do you do with Mr. Milosevic? That is pending in front of the Committee on International Relations right now.

There is another piece of legislation introduced by many Members from the Democrat side, with some bipartisan support from the Republican side, that takes a similar approach in Palestine and says do we want to give Palestinians foreign aid money in the face of what appears is going on in the peace process, or should we use that money as a tool to get both parties back at the table with maybe a more cooperative attitude?

These, Mr. Speaker, are important issues. These are bipartisan issues. These are not things that, well, we are going to haggle over and see who can claim victory on this or that, but things that sincere Members of Congress with serious legislative proposals have come to the floor and said, you know what, the appropriation bills are somewhat the last train leaving town, can you put these amendments on the bills? We are narrowed down to the home stretch, and that is what takes so long.

But this is America. This is a Republic, where everybody has opinions. That is why it has taken so long for us to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to reconsider their positions and support this continuing resolution, so that we can keep the government operating, not have a shutdown, and finalize these very, very important issues.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we are now 6 weeks beyond the deadline for completing our work on the budget. The main reason we are that far behind is not because of what is happening now; it is because for 8 months this Congress proceeded under false pretenses, and the majority party pretended that there was enough room in the budget to pass their gigantic tax package, most of which favored the most well-off and the most privileged among us.

Now, one by one, the appropriation subcommittees are finally being allowed to produce bills that reflect in real terms what both parties recognize needs to be provided for science, for transportation, for housing. We finished a bill just a few minutes ago that finally recognized reality.

But for 8 months, because of the political pretense that the surpluses were going to be large enough that you could make all of these wild tax promises to everybody, we have proceeded on the assumption that this Congress is going to spend about \$40 billion to \$50 billion less than it will wind up spending. Now, in fact, ironically, some of the appropriation bills are coming back in excess of the President's request; and some of that is justified, in my view, and some of that is not.

But now we have a real problem, because we are down to the last few issues. And, yes, there is an issue remaining on family planning; and, yes, there are a couple of other issues remaining in other bills, but essentially there are very few differences remaining between the majority party and us.

The main issue that remains is education, and, to a secondary extent, what we are going to spend on health programs and on worker protection and worker training programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a lot of talk in the press about the legislative chaos that has produced the requirement for a series of continuing resolutions. I do not believe that that is the case. I am coming increasingly to believe that these delays are purposeful, and I would like to explain why.

This calendar shows in red seven days a week, a normal weekly schedule. This calendar shows in red the times that we have been in session since Labor Day. I want to walk you through it.

The week after Labor Day we were in for less than 24 hours. We came in after 6 o'clock on Wednesday and left before 6 o'clock on Thursday.

The next week we were in about 48 hours. We came in at 6 o'clock on Tuesday and were gone by that time on Thursday.

The next week we were here, as you can see, parts of 4 days, but, actually, in terms of real time spent, about 3 days of work.

If you get down to the week of October 2, that is the only week since Labor Day that we have put in a 5-day week here.

Do you see what happened last week? We came in late on Tuesday; the week was foreshortened by the unfortunate death of our colleague, Mr. Vento.

This week we were in session for a couple of hours yesterday, starting very late in the afternoon, around 5 o'clock, and we will be out of session by sometime between 6 and 7 o'clock tonight.

□ 1445

It is a little over a day today, and then people will be at another funeral Friday. I think what this schedule does is to make it easier and easier for the majority party to avoid ever having to face up and actually vote on the issues that divide us on the issue of education.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I think is going on, and so now what is going to happen is when this CR is passed to keep the government open another week, what will happen is we will have a brief meeting around 4:00 or 5:00 today in the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. There may be another meeting after that; but I will tell you something, I have been stuck here, I feel like a fugitive on a chain gang, because as the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, I have been here 3 weekends out of the last 4 weekends through the weekend, so has Mr. Lew from the White House.

The President has always been a phone call away, and yet while we have been waiting for something to happen, nothing has happened. Why? Because the leadership of both Houses refused to delegate the decision-making power fully to the committee with the responsibility to get the work done, that is the Committee on Appropriations. That is the problem. Well, I will tell you something, I have got some things I want to do in my district, too.

I see the leadership going all over the country campaigning for marginal Members. In my view, if I have to stay here, they ought to stay here. So if you want me to stay in town this weekend, I want to know that the Speaker, the floor leader, the deputy floor leader and all of the people making the real decisions are going to stay here, too, but they are not going to. They will be out of town while the appropriators will be stuck here pretending that something real is going on.

Now, to me, if you want to get a decision made, delegate it to the people who know how to work it out. If you do not trust their judgment, then stay in town yourselves and sit down with your opposite Members and our leadership and get the job done, but do not ask the appropriators to stay in town to give the rest of the leadership cover while they go off to campaign around the country.

If we pass resolutions like this, we are going to be here until next Satur-

day and probably the following Saturday, and that will get us so close to the election that, in the end, what you will have been able to do is to avoid voting on the issues on education that divide us. That is what I believe the game plan is. That may suit your partisan purposes, but it does not suit the needs of the country or this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this continuing resolution because we ought to have one that makes us be back here Sunday or Monday for everybody to get the work done.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I really had not intended to speak on the rule, but my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has excited my imagination here. When I saw his chart, I decided to bring out a larger chart that, more or less, reinforces what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has said, but I am going to take a little different spin on it.

My spin is the Committee on Appropriations has done its job in the House. The House appropriators have done their job. I hope that we can focus on this fiscal year calendar, which is a little easier to understand than the one that the gentleman had. If you look at all of the red colored days in October, November, December, January, February, March and part of April, that is how much time all of the fiscal year that is gone before the Committee on Appropriations ever gets a budget resolution, which is when we can begin our work appropriating, which is what the Constitution tells us to do.

The blue colored days are the days that the House has not been in session. And in order to get 13 bills through 13 sets of hearings, meaning 200 to 300 hearings and 13 subcommittee markups and 13 full committee markups and 13 bills on the Floor, we have only the green colored days available to do that. That is part of the problem.

The budget resolution does not get adopted until after these red days are all gone leaving only the green days, that is a problem with the budget process.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to the gentleman the only difference between his chart and mine is that his chart in the green gives credit for the entire day even if we have only been allowed to be in session for a couple of hours. So the charts are essentially in agreement.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I do admit that the gentleman's chart did go down to the hour. I was tempted to make mine go down to the minute to compete with his, but I thought just days would be good enough.

But the point is that despite this problem of time, the House did its job. We got our bills out of here, and the 13th bill, which was for the District of Columbia, was on this floor in July before we went to the August recess. Now, that bill was not completed at that time. It was pulled off the floor, and we did not get back to it until August.

The gentleman is correct that there is a problem of time here, but other things needed to be done. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), I thought, made a good point. Once we did our job, that was only part of the process, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has told us so many times there is no use getting to first base if you cannot get home.

The truth of the matter is you cannot get home if you do not get to first base. And so getting through our committee work was first base; going through the House floor that was second base; then you have to go through the other body. We have a bicameral legislature. The other body, the United States Senate, has to do the same thing that we do, they have to pass all the bills too.

Well, this year they did not pass all their bills. This year they still have not passed all of their bills, and so we have to come up with creative ways to pass a bill through the system that has not passed in the other body. And so far we have done that.

We did a bill today that, more or less, went through that creative process. The VA, HUD bill went through that process. But now then where does that leave us? Even after the other body passes the bills, their priorities may be different than ours, and most of the time they are. So we have to sit down together and reason together to figure out what is a responsible way to present this package to both the House and the Senate, so that we can get it passed in both the House and Senate. That takes a little bit of time.

We have been spending a lot of time, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said. Appropriators have been here day after day after day, whether they were colored red, blue or green on my calendar. Appropriators have been here dealing with these differences. But then there is another factor before you get to home base, that is the President of the United States. When a bill gets to his desk, he has a power that is the same as two-thirds of the House and the Senate, because if that one person, the President of the United States, does not approve of the bill and he vetoes it, it takes a two-thirds vote in both the House and Senate to override the veto.

Well, we have a small majority in this Congress. We do not have a two-thirds vote; although, we did override the President's veto on the Energy and Water bill in the House just a few days ago, but, nevertheless, because we have a small majority, we have to work with the President and with his staff to try

to send bills out of here that he will sign, so that we do not have to be here week after week waiting for those vetoes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned the education bill. We have been meeting with the White House on the education bill now for weeks, and we still have not come to a conclusion with the President on what is going to be in that bill. What will he sign? Earlier there was a strategy to send him a bill and let him veto it and send it back.

We rejected that strategy. We thought we should work with the President, work with the minority party, and that is what we have been trying to do. The minority staff has been involved in every meeting with the majority staff, but those things take time.

And I am as frustrated as my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations. I wish this work would have been done in July when the House finished passing the bills but we only control one-third of the process. And that is one reason that it is taking more time.

I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), in as friendly a way as I can say it that we have spent many days on appropriations bills in this House that were unnecessary. The majority party allowed the minority party hour upon hour of debate on amendments that we all knew were not in order; that were not protected by the rule; that were subject to a point of order, but yet we allowed the minority party all of that extra time because they wanted to make their arguments.

We believe in freedom of speech. This is a debating society in this House. So we allowed many, many days of debate on appropriations bills that really were not necessary, except for the political debate that was going on. Had we not done that, had we just decided to jam the minority party, we would not have allowed those amendments to even be discussed. We would have raised a point of order against them immediately, but we allowed them to go on for hour upon hour upon hour before finally raising the point of order or before they were withdrawn by the sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, when we get right down to it, time is a problem. But I would suggest that the majority party is not any more guilty of absorbing and using the time than the minority party or the President of the United States. You see it seems in this process everybody has to have it their way or no way, but when we are dealing with a bicameral legislature and a President of the United States, we have to come together.

It is amazing. On the bill that we just passed, we passed it with a large vote. It was a good bill, because we finally came together, and we made it happen. We had the Agriculture appropriations bills a few days ago. We came together. We worked together. And we produced a good product.

We do not need to have political rhetoric. We do not need that. The political points ought to be made back home on the campaign trail. In here, we should do the people's business. In here, people should come before politics. Back home is where we do our politics. Here we do the people's business.

We should expedite this business the best we can, and we should be thorough, and we should be responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me as much time as he did.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) says that the majority gave us a lot of time to talk about issues that concerned us. They gave us a lot of time, but they did not allow us to get any votes on the issues that demonstrated where we wanted to take this country on education, on health care and a whole range of other issues.

The gentleman used the Committee on Rules and you used the budget resolution to prevent us from ever having votes on our alternatives while you were free to put yours on the floor. If you want me to change time for votes any time, I would be happy to do that. We would have had much the better deal.

Secondly, I would point out, that is consistent with what you have done across the board. You did not give us an opportunity to have a vote on our version of a prescription drug bill under Medicare, so we wound up with your bill of goods rather than our bill being on the floor.

On the tax bill, we were not allowed to have a vote on our alternative, so we had to reshape our alternative to fit it into your rules.

□ 1500

The fact remains, in the last 6 years they have tried to cut education \$13 billion below the President's budgets, and they have tried to cut education below previous year's spending levels by \$5.7 billion over that time period, and it has been only because of the fights that we and the White House have waged that we were able to add \$15 billion over that period of time to the various appropriation bills for education.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an insert on Republican attacks relating to education and a number of charts illustrating education numbers:

The material referred to is as follows:  
EFFORTS TO ATTACK EDUCATION—1994  
THROUGH 2000

Across the nation Republican Congressional Candidates are giving speeches and running ads pretending to be friends of education. Those speeches and ads fly in the face of the historical record of the past six years. That record demonstrates that education has been one of the central targets of House Republican efforts to cut federal investments

in programs essential for building America's future in order to provide large tax cuts they have been promising their constituents.

Six years ago in their drive to take control of the House of Representatives, the Republican Leaders led by Newt Gingrich produced a so-called "Contract with America" which they claimed would balance the budget while at the same time making room for huge tax cuts. They indicated that one of the ways they would do so was by abolishing four departments of the federal government. Eliminating the U.S. Department of Education was their number one goal. They also wanted they said to eliminate the Departments of Energy, Commerce and HUD.

Immediately upon taking over the Congress in 1995 they proposed cuts below existing appropriations in a rescission bill, HR 1158. That bill passed the House on March 16, 1995 reducing federal expenditures by nearly \$12 billion. Education programs accounted for \$1.7 billion of the total. While the budget of the Department of Education totaled only 1.6% of federal expenditures in fiscal 1995, it contributed 14% to the spending reductions in the House Republican package. The package was adopted with all but six House Republicans voting in favor. (See Roll Call #251 for the 104th Congress, 1st session—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 16, 1995, page H3302)

Next, legislation (HR 1883) was introduced which called for "eliminating the Department of Education and redefining the federal role in education." The legislation was co-sponsored by more than half of all House Republicans including as original cosponsors, current Speaker Dennis Hastert, Majority Leader Dick Armey, and Majority Whip Tom Delay.

The desire to eliminate the Department of Education was stated explicitly in both the Report that accompanied the Republican Budget Resolution passed by the House and in the Conference Report on the Budget that accompanied the final product agreed to by both House and Senate Republicans. The Conference Report for H. Con. Res. 76 (the FY 1996 Budget Resolution) states flatly, "In the area of education, the House assumes the termination of the Department of Education."

That FY96 Budget Resolution not only proposed the adoption of legislation to terminate the Department organizationally, but put in place a spending plan to eliminate funding for a major portion of the Department's activities and programs in hopes of partially achieving the goal of elimination even if the President refused to sign a formal termination for the Department. The Conference Agreement adopted on June 29, 1995 proposed cuts in funding for Function 500, the area of the budget containing all federal education programs, or \$17.6 billion or 34 percent below the amount needed to keep even with inflation over the six-year period starting in Fiscal 1996. The House passed Resolution had proposed even larger cuts. Every House Republican except one voted for both the House Resolution and the Conference Report.

That Budget Resolution established a framework for passage of the 13 appropriation bills. The Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, which contains the vast majority of funds that go to local school districts, was the hardest hit by that resolution. The Fiscal 1996 appropriations bill for labor, health, and education was adopted by the House on August 4th 1995. It slashed funding from the \$25 billion level that had been originally approved for the Department in fiscal 1995 to \$20.8 billion for the coming year. This \$4.2 billion or 17 percent cut below prior year levels was even larger when inflation was considered and was passed in the face of information indicating that total

school enrollment in the United States was increasing by about three quarters of a million students a year. The programs affected by these cuts included Title I for disadvantaged children (reduced by \$1.1 billion below the prior year), teacher training (reduced by \$251 million), vocational education (reduced by \$273 million), Safe and Drug Free Schools (reduced by \$241 million), and Goals 2000 to raise student performance (reduced by \$361 million). Republicans voted in favor of the bill, 213 to 18. (See Roll Call #626 for the 104th Congress, 1st session—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 4, 1995, page H8420) The bill was opposed by virtually every national organization representing parents, teachers, school administrators, and local school boards.

The Republican Leadership of the House was so determined to force the President to sign that legislation and other similar appropriations that they were willing to see the government shut down twice to, in the words of one Republican Leader, "force the President to his knees." Speaker Gingrich said, "On October 1, if we don't appropriate, there is no money \* \* \* You can veto whatever you want to. But as of October 1, there is no government \* \* \* We're going to go over the liberal Democratic part of the government and then say to them: 'We could last 60 days, 90 days, 120 days, five years, a century.' There's a lot of stuff we don't care if it's ever funded. (Rocky Mountain News, June 3, 1995) It is clear that the Labor-HHS-Education bill, and education funding in particular, was at the heart of the controversy that resulted in those government shutdowns. Cutting education was an issue that Republicans felt so strongly about that they literally were willing to see the government shut down in an attempt to achieve this goal. Speaker Gingrich said, "I don't care what the price is. I don't care if we have no executive offices, and no bonds for 60 days—not this time." (Washington Post, September 22, 1995) House Republican Whip Tom DeLay said, "We are going to fund only those programs we want to fund \* \* \* We're in charge. We don't have to negotiate with the Senate; we don't have to negotiate with the Democrats." (Baltimore Sun, January 8, 1996)

When the government shut down, the public reacted strongly against Republican House Leadership hard-headedness and that led to the eventual signing of the Conference Agreement on Labor HHS-Education funding as part of an omnibus appropriations package on April 26, 1996, more than halfway through the fiscal year. That action came after 9 continuing resolutions and those two government shutdowns. That agreement restored about half of the cuts below prior year funding that had been pushed through by the Republican Majority, raising the original House Republican figure of \$20.8 billion for education to \$22.8 billion.

Later in 1996 the Republican House Caucus organized another attempt to cut education funding below prior year levels in the fiscal 1997 Labor-HHS-Education bill. Only July 12, 1996 the House adopted the bill with Republicans voting 209 to 22 in favor of passage (See Roll Call #313, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 11, 1996, page H7373.) The bill cut Education by \$54 million below the levels agreed to for fiscal 1996 and \$2.8 billion below the President's request. During the debate on that bill Republicans also voted (227-2) to kill an amendment specifically aimed at restoring \$1.2 billion in education funding. (See Roll Call #303, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 11, 1996, page H7330).

As the fall and election of 1996 began to approach, the Republican commitment to cut education began to be overshadowed by their desire to adjourn Congress and go home to campaign. As a result, the President and

Democrats in Congress forced them to accept an education package that was more \$3.6 billion above House passed levels.

1997 brought a one-year respite from Republican efforts to squeeze education. For one year, a welcome bipartisan approach was followed and the appropriation that passed the House and the final conference agreement were extremely close to the amounts requested by the President and the Department of Education.

Conflict between the two parties over education funding erupted again in 1998 when the President requested \$31.2 billion for the Department for fiscal 1999. In July, the House Appropriations Committee reported on a party line vote a Labor-HHS-Education bill that cut the President's education budget by more than \$660 million. But the bill remained in legislative limbo until after the beginning of the next fiscal year. Then on October 2, 1998 Republicans voted with only six dissenting votes to bring the bill to the floor. (See Roll Call #476, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 2, 1998, page H9314). The leadership then reversed itself on its desire to call up the bill and refused to bring it to the floor. The House Republican Leadership finally grudgingly agreed to negotiate higher levels for education so they could return home and campaign. The White House and Democrats in Congress were able to force them to accept a funding level for education that was \$2.6 billion above the House bill.

Last year, in 1999, House Republican Leaders again directed their Appropriators to report a Labor-HHS-Education Appropriation bill that cut education spending below the President's request and below the level of the prior year. The FY2000 bill reported by the Appropriations Committee on a straight party line vote funded education programs at nearly \$200 million below the FY1999 level. The bill was almost \$1.4 billion below the President's request. Included in the cuts below requested levels were reductions in Title I grants to local school districts for education of disadvantaged students (\$264 million), after school programs (\$300 million), education reform and accountability efforts (\$491 million), and improvement of educational technology resources (\$301 million). Because inadequate funding threatened their ability to pass the bill, House Republican Leaders never brought it to the House floor. After weeks of pressure from House Democrats they ordered a separate bill that had been agreed to with Senate Republican Leaders to be brought to the House floor. The bill contained significantly more education funding than the original House bill but still cut the President's request for class size reduction by \$200 million, after-school programs by \$300 million, Title I by almost \$200 million and teacher quality programs by \$353 million. The bill was opposed by the Committee for Education Funding which represents 97 national organizations interested in education including parent and teacher groups, school boards, and school administrators. It was adopted by a vote of 218 to 211 with House Republicans voting 214 to 7 in favor. (See Roll Call #549, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 28, 1999, page H11120) It was also promptly vetoed by the President. After further negotiations, they agreed on November 18th to add nearly \$700 million more, which we were requesting to education programs.

This year the President proposed a \$4.5 billion increase for education programs in the FY2001 budget. The bill reported by House Republicans cut the President's request by \$2.9 billion. Cuts below the request included \$400 million from Title I, \$400 million from after school programs, \$1 billion for improving teacher quality and \$1.3 billion for repair

of dilapidated school buildings. It was adopted by a vote of 217-214 with House Republicans voting 213 to 7 in favor. (See Roll Call #273, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 2000, page H4436).

When the FY2001 Labor-HHS-Education bill was sent to conference a motion to instruct Conferees to go to the higher Senate levels for education and other programs was offered. It also instructed conferees to permit language insuring that funds provided for reducing class size and repairing school buildings was used for those purposes. It was defeated 207 to 212 with Republicans voting 208 to 4 in opposition. (See Roll Call #415, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 19, 2000, page H6563).

In summary, the record clearly shows that over the past six years House Republicans set the elimination of the Department of Education as a primary goal. Failing that, they attempted to reduce education funding to the maximum extent possible. In every year since they have had control of the House of Representatives they have attempted to cut the President's request for education funding. Appropriations bills passed by House Republicans would have cut a total of \$14.6 billion from presidential requests for education funding. In three of the six years that they have controlled the House, they have actually attempted to cut education funding below prior year levels despite steady increases in school enrollment and the annual increase in costs to local school districts of providing quality classroom instruction.

The education budget cuts have not been directed at Washington bureaucrats as some Republicans have tried to argue but mainly at programs that send money directly to local school districts to hire teachers and improve curriculum. Programs such as Title I, After School, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Class Size Reduction, and Educational Technology Assistance all send well over 95% of their funds directly to local school districts. While zealots in the Republican Conference drove much of this agenda it is clear that they could not have succeeded without the repeated assistance from dozens of Republican moderates who attempt to portray themselves as friends of education.

The one redeeming aspect of the Republican record on education over the last six years is that in most years they failed to achieve the cuts that they spent most of each year fighting to impose. When a coalition between the Democrats in Congress and the President made it clear that the bills containing these cuts would be vetoed and that the Republicans by themselves could not override the vetoes, legislation that was far more favorable to education was finally adopted. For Republican members to attempt to take credit for that fact is in effect bragging on their own political ineptitude. The question concerned Americans must ask is: What will happen if the Republicans find a future opportunity to deliver on their six-year agenda? They may eventually become more skillful in their efforts. They may at some point have a larger majority in one or both Houses or they may serve under a President that will be more amenable to their

agenda. All of these prospects should be very troubling to those who feel that local school districts cannot do the job that the country needs without great assistance from the federal government.

This is not an issue of local versus federal control. Almost 93% of the money spent for elementary and secondary education at the local level is spent in accordance with the wishes of state and local governments. But there are national implications to failing schools in any part of the country. The federal government has an obligation to try to help disseminate information about what does and does not work in educating children, and it has an obligation to respond to critical needs by defining and focusing on national priorities. And that is what the other 7% of educational funding in this country does. Education is indeed primarily a local responsibility, but it must be a top priority at all levels—federal, state, and local—or we will not get the job done.

The House Republican candidates now shout loudly that they can be trusted to support education, but their record over the last six years speaks louder than their words. Their record shows that in three of the last six years, House Republicans tried to cut education \$5.5 billion below previous levels and \$14.6 billion below presidential requests. It shows that the more than \$15.6 billion that has been restored came only after Democrats in Congress and in the White House demanded restoration. That is the record that must be understood by those concerned about education's future.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION APPROPRIATION CUTS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEAR

(Millions of dollars)

	Prior year	House level	House cut
FY 95 Rescission .....	25,074	23,440	-1,635
FY 96 Labor-HHS-Education .....	25,074	20,797	-4,277
FY 97 Labor-HHS-Education .....	22,810	22,756	-54
FY 00 Labor-HHS-Education .....	33,520	33,321	-199

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION CUTS BELOW PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(Millions of Dollars)

	Request	House level	House cut	Percent cut
FY 96 Labor-HHS-Education .....	25,804	20,797	-5,007	-19
FY 97 Labor-HHS-Education .....	25,561	22,756	-2,805	-11
FY 98 Labor-HHS-Education .....	29,522	29,331	-191	-1
FY 99 Labor-HHS-Education .....	31,185	30,523	-662	-2
FY 00 Labor-HHS-Education .....	34,712	33,321	-1,391	-4
FY 01 Labor-HHS-Education .....	40,095	37,142	-2,953	-7
Total FY96 to FY01 .....	186,879	173,870	-13,009	-7

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION FUNDING RESTORED BY DEMOCRATS

(Millions of Dollars)

	House level	Conf. agreement	Restoration	Percent increase
FY 95 Rescission .....	23,440	24,497	1,057	5
FY 96 Labor-HHS-Education .....	20,797	22,810	2,013	10
FY 97 Labor-HHS-Education .....	22,756	26,324	3,568	16
FY 98 Labor-HHS-Education .....	29,331	29,741	410	1
FY 99 Labor-HHS-Education .....	30,523	33,149	2,626	9
FY 00 Labor-HHS-Education .....	33,321	35,703	2,382	7
FY 01 Labor-HHS-Education .....	37,142	40,751	3,609	10
Total FY95 to FY01 .....	197,310	212,975	15,665	8

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the gentleman from Wisconsin what the Committee on Rules did on the appropriation bills was to use the standing rules of the House. Those who were offering amendments germane to the subject matter were allowed votes, those who did not were not allowed votes.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

I have enjoyed this collegial debate between the Chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Appro-

priations. I only wish the rest of the House worked as well.

The gentleman from Georgia stated that the government functions. The government functions just fine. The Republican leadership is what is dysfunctional in this town.

For example, there is no one in this room, there is no one in this country, particularly the seniors, who do not



know that it is time to have a prescription drug benefit for the seniors. We who legislate in other committees and have the responsibility for a prescription drug benefit have not been allowed to participate in any of that discussion.

For example, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means with me has voted two or three times, along with every other Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means, to deny the seniors in this country a discount on their prescription drugs. Just think, being from Florida, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) is with lots of seniors, how could the gentleman vote two or three times to deny even bringing to the floor for discussion a discount for seniors for their prescription drugs? Those are the kinds of things that are being held up.

This House passed a Patients' Bill of Rights, a bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights to bring under control the managed care plans, the HMOs that provide service to our citizens. That bill is tied up. It is dead in the water because the Republicans refuse to move it along.

What have they done instead? In a balanced budget give-back bill, as it is called, a bill that helped our health care providers and to some extent our beneficiaries, they are rewarding the managed care plans with somewhere between \$6 and \$30 billion.

Why do I not know why? Because no one will tell the Democrats what is in the bill. The bill is in the Speaker's office. Lobbyists are parading in and out of the Speaker's office working on the Republican bill, and not telling the rest of the Members.

At any rate, as near as we can determine, there is somewhere between \$6 and \$30 billion going as a reward to the managed care plans, regardless of whether they provide a prescription drug benefit or maintain the effort of keeping their plans open in rural areas; no strings attached, take the money and run. They give a reward of that magnitude to the very people that we voted to regulate.

What would we do if we did not give that money to the managed care plans? We would give 2 extra years of update to the hospitals, we would help home health care, and we would provide more benefits for our beneficiaries. That is what is going on under all of this as the Republicans stall the work of this Congress.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the continuing resolution because I think it is time we got about the people's business. The decisions that we will be making in the next few days and next week are about our national budget,

the appropriation of funds to meet the needs of the American people.

I believe that our national budget should be a statement of our national values. What we think is important is what we should put our resources to. So we are coming down to the last few or several appropriations bills. One of them is Labor, Health, and Human Services, which is the lion's share of our domestic budget. In that budget we fund the Department of Education and the Federal role in education. In that bill we also fund the National Institutes of Health.

All of the studies that we receive from the National Institutes of Health and other research organizations that are funded by the Federal government tell us that children learn better in smaller classes. Indeed, we are even learning that some children do better in smaller schools.

We pay for this research. We have the best scientists in the world applying their intellects to it. They give us their conclusions. Then this body chooses to ignore those conclusions about smaller classes and smaller schools.

President Clinton has an initiative on the table which has been rejected by the Republican majority. The President's proposal would provide interest-free loans for localities to have bond measures for school modernization, for smaller classes, and rewiring schools.

If we are going to have smaller classes, we need more classrooms and we need more teachers. If we are going to have our children prepared for the future, we need to have these schools modernized, wired for the future.

It is really very, very difficult to understand how the Republican majority can reject such a reasonable proposal, a proposal based on science and for the well-being of America's children. That by and large is the main argument that is keeping us here.

At the same time, the Republican majority has chosen to take four- or five-day weekends, instead of attending to a prescription drug benefit for our seniors, a real prescription drug benefit for our seniors; instead of a subsidized premium for insurance companies, which they may or may not even decide to offer; and to attend to a real Patients' Bill of Rights.

But it is about the children that we are here. The Republican majority is asking us to vote for a continuing resolution, not so that we can continue our work until we are finished, but so that we can go home for 4 or 5 days, come back with work unfinished, and ask for another continuing resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the CR.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are having an argument that is worth having. The argument is predicated on this, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) just said.

In the springtime, the majority passed a budget that was predicated on the proposition that we should pass sweeping tax cuts in this year's budget. We disagree with that. That is an argument worth having. We believe that the principal fiscal focus of this country should be on reducing the national debt.

Beyond that, we are having another argument that is worth having about whether we should invest in education more or less, yes or no. We believe, and I think a majority of this House believes, Mr. Speaker, that investment in education should happen.

The reason we are having this argument, the reason we have overshot our deadline by 2 weeks, is that we will stand on principle.

We believe that assistance for school districts around this country in modernizing their schools and building new ones is worth fighting for.

We believe that putting a qualified teacher in every classroom in America, so that particularly in the primary grades children get more one-on-one attention, is worth staying and fighting for.

And we believe that programs like after-school programs, drug and alcohol education, are worth funding to their highest and most practical level. It is an argument worth having.

I commend the Committee on Appropriations for their diligence in moving the process forward, but we will stick to our principles and invest in debt reduction and education improvement for the benefit of the people of this country.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wishes to stick to his principles with respect to debt reduction, he can support these bills, because each of these appropriation bills has a special line item for debt reduction.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to move the end of the continuing resolution up 2 days from Wednesday, October 25, to Monday, October 23. If we do not move the deadline, there will be no pressure to work, and American families will continue to get short shrift from this Republican Congress.

We need to rebuild our schools. We need to hire new teachers. We need to stay in session until we get the work done.

The text of the amendment, if offered, is as follows:

On page 2, line 4, strike "and (2)" and add after the semicolon, "(2) the amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution which shall be considered as adopted; and (3) "



At the end of the resolution, add "Section 2. The amendment to H. J. Res 114 Strike "October 25, 2000" and insert "October 23, 2000"

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the previous question so we can move on with the vote on the rule and get the continuing resolution on the floor to keep the government open, running, and responsible until we finish our work, our very difficult work this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 193, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—212

Aderholt	DeLay	Hostettler
Archer	DeMint	Houghton
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Hulshof
Bachus	Dickey	Hunter
Baker	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Ballenger	Dreier	Hyde
Barr	Duncan	Isakson
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Istook
Bartlett	Ehlers	Jenkins
Barton	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Bass	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Bereuter	English	Jones (NC)
Biggert	Everett	Kasich
Bilbray	Ewing	Kelly
Bilirakis	Fletcher	Kind (WI)
Bliley	Foley	King (NY)
Blunt	Fossella	Kingston
Boehlert	Fowler	Knollenberg
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Bonilla	Galleghy	Kuykendall
Bono	Ganske	LaHood
Brady (TX)	Gekas	Largent
Bryant	Gibbons	Latham
Burr	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Burton	Gillmor	Leach
Buyer	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Callahan	Goode	Linder
Calvert	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Camp	Goodling	Lucas (OK)
Canady	Goss	Manzullo
Cannon	Graham	Martinez
Castle	Granger	McCrery
Chabot	Green (WI)	McHugh
Chambliss	Greenwood	McInnis
Coble	Gutknecht	McKeon
Coburn	Hastings (WA)	Metcalfe
Collins	Hayes	Mica
Combest	Hayworth	Miller, Gary
Cook	Hefley	Moore
Cox	Herger	Moran (KS)
Crane	Hill (MT)	Morella
Cubin	Hilleary	Myrick
Cunningham	Hobson	Nethercutt
Davis (VA)	Hoekstra	Ney
Deal	Horn	Northup

Norwood	Ryan (WI)
Nussle	Ryun (KS)
Ose	Salmon
Packard	Sanford
Paul	Saxton
Pease	Scarborough
Peterson (PA)	Schaffer
Petri	Sensenbrenner
Pickering	Sessions
Pitts	Shadegg
Pombo	Shaw
Porter	Sherwood
Portman	Shimkus
Pryce (OH)	Shuster
Quinn	Simpson
Radanovich	Skeen
Ramstad	Smith (MI)
Regula	Smith (NJ)
Reynolds	Smith (TX)
Riley	Souder
Rogan	Spence
Rogers	Stearns
Rohrabacher	Stump
Ros-Lehtinen	Sununu
Roukema	Sweeney
Royce	Tancredo

NAYS—193

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Murtha
Allen	Gordon	Nadler
Andrews	Green (TX)	Napolitano
Baca	Gutierrez	Neal
Baird	Hall (OH)	Obey
Baldacci	Hall (TX)	Olver
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Barcia	Hill (IN)	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Pallone
Becerra	Hinchev	Pascarell
Bentsen	Hinojosa	Pastor
Berkley	Hoeffel	Payne
Berman	Holden	Pelosi
Berry	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Hooley	Phelps
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Pickett
Blumenauer	Insee	Pomeroy
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Boswell	(TX)	Rangel
Boucher	Jefferson	Reyes
Boyd	John	Rivers
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Kennedy	Sabo
Capuano	Kildee	Sanchez
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Carson	Klecza	Sandlin
Clayton	Kucinich	Sawyer
Clement	LaFalce	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lampson	Scott
Condit	Lantos	Serrano
Costello	Larson	Sherman
Coyne	Lee	Shows
Cramer	Levin	Sisisky
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cummings	Lofgren	Slughter
Danner	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Luther	Stabenow
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Stark
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
DeLahunt	Markey	Strickland
DeLauro	Mascara	Stupak
Deutsch	Matsui	Tanner
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Dixon	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McGovern	Thurman
Dooley	McIntyre	Tierney
Doyle	McKinney	Towns
Edwards	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Engel	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Velazquez
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Evans	Menendez	Walters
Farr	Millender	Watt (NC)
Fattah	McDonald	Waxman
Filner	Miller, George	Weiner
Forbes	Minge	Wexler
Ford	Mink	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Wu
Frost	Mollohan	Wynn

NOT VOTING—27

Campbell	Cooksey	Jones (OH)
Chenoweth-Hage	Franks (NJ)	Klink
Clay	Gephardt	Lazio
Conyers	Hansen	Lewis (CA)

Lipinski	Oxley	Talent
McCollum	Rodriguez	Thompson (MS)
McIntosh	Rush	Turner
Miller (FL)	Shays	Weygand
Oberstar	Spratt	Wise

□ 1529

Messrs. ROTHMAN, UDALL of New Mexico, EVANS and Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 187, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

AYES—209

Abercrombie	Fletcher	McHugh
Aderholt	Foley	McInnis
Archer	Fossella	McKeon
Armey	Fowler	Metcalfe
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Mica
Baker	Galleghy	Miller, Gary
Ballenger	Ganske	Mollohan
Barr	Gibbons	Moore
Barrett (NE)	Gilchrest	Moran (KS)
Bartlett	Gillmor	Morella
Barton	Goode	Murtha
Bass	Goodlatte	Myrick
Bereuter	Goodling	Nethercutt
Biggert	Goss	Ney
Bilbray	Graham	Northup
Bilirakis	Granger	Norwood
Blagojevich	Green (WI)	Nussle
Bliley	Greenwood	Ose
Blunt	Gutknecht	Packard
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Boehner	Hayes	Pease
Bonilla	Hayworth	Peterson (PA)
Bono	Hefley	Petri
Brady (TX)	Herger	Pitts
Bryant	Hill (MT)	Pombo
Burr	Hilleary	Porter
Burton	Hobson	Portman
Buyer	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Callahan	Horn	Quinn
Calvert	Hostettler	Ramstad
Camp	Houghton	Reynolds
Canady	Hulshof	Riley
Cannon	Hunter	Roemer
Castle	Hutchinson	Rogan
Chabot	Hyde	Rogers
Chambliss	Isakson	Rohrabacher
Coble	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Coburn	Jenkins	Roukema
Collins	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Cook	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)
Cooksey	Kasich	Salmon
Cox	Kelly	Sanford
Crane	King (NY)	Saxton
Cubin	Kingston	Scarborough
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Schaffer
Deal	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	Kuykendall	Sessions
DeMint	LaHood	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart	Largent	Shaw
Dickey	Latham	Sherwood
Doolittle	LaTourette	Shimkus
Dreier	Leach	Shuster
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Ehlers	Linder	Skeen
Ehrlich	LoBiondo	Smith (MI)
Emerson	Lucas (OK)	Smith (NJ)
English	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Everett	Martinez	Souder
Ewing	McCrery	Spence

Stearns	Tiaht	Weldon (FL)
Stump	Toomey	Weldon (PA)
Sununu	Trafficant	Weller
Sweeney	Upton	Whitfield
Tancredo	Vitter	Wicker
Taylor (NC)	Walden	Wilson
Terry	Walsh	Wolf
Thomas	Wamp	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Watkins	Young (FL)
Thune	Watts (OK)	

NOES—187

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Moakley
Allen	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Andrews	Green (TX)	Nadler
Baca	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Baird	Hall (OH)	Neal
Baldacci	Hall (TX)	Olver
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Barcia	Hill (IN)	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Pallone
Becerra	Hinchev	Pascrell
Bentsen	Hinojosa	Pastor
Berkley	Hoefel	Payne
Berman	Holden	Pelosi
Berry	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Hooley	Phelps
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Pickett
Bonior	Inslee	Pomeroy
Borski	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Boucher	(TX)	Rangel
Boyd	Jefferson	Reyes
Brady (PA)	John	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Kaptur	Sabo
Capuano	Kennedy	Sanchez
Cardin	Kildee	Sanders
Carson	Kilpatrick	Sandlin
Clayton	Kind (WI)	Sawyer
Clyburn	Klecicka	Schakowsky
Condit	Kucinich	Scott
Costello	LaFalce	Serrano
Coyne	Lampson	Sherman
Cramer	Lantos	Shows
Crowley	Larson	Sisisky
Cummings	Lee	Skelton
Danner	Levin	Slaughter
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Snyder
DeFazio	Lowey	Stabenow
DeGette	Lucas (KY)	Stark
Delahunt	Luther	Stenholm
DeLauro	Maloney (CT)	Strickland
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Stupak
Dicks	Markey	Tanner
Dingell	Mascara	Tauscher
Dixon	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dooley	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Doyle	McDermott	Tierney
Edwards	McGovern	Towns
Engel	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	McKinney	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	McNulty	Velazquez
Evans	Meehan	Vislosky
Farr	Meek (FL)	Waters
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Watt (NC)
Filner	Menendez	Waxman
Forbes	Millender-	Weiner
Ford	McDonald	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Woolsey
Frost	Minge	Wu
Gejdenson	Mink	Wynn

NOT VOTING—36

Campbell	Jones (OH)	Radanovich
Chenoweth-Hage	Klink	Regula
Clay	Lazio	Rodriguez
Clement	Lewis (CA)	Rush
Conyers	Lipinski	Shays
Davis (VA)	McCollum	Spratt
Dunn	McIntosh	Talent
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Gekas	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Gephardt	Obey	Turner
Gilman	Oxley	Weygand
Hansen	Pickering	Wise

□ 1538

Mr. DIXON and Mr. CONDIT changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 398

Mr. PASCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H. Res. 398.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 637, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 114 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 114

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.* That Public Law 106-275, if further amended by striking "October 20, 2000" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 25, 2000". Notwithstanding section 106 of Public Law 106-275, funds shall be available and obligations for mandatory payments due on or about November 1, 2000, may continue to be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 637, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the CR before us now should not require much debate, since we did have a very lively debate on the rule on the very same subject, but I am sure the same subjects will be discussed again. But this does extend the funding for the fiscal year until next Wednesday.

It is essential to pass this CR because, although the House has completed its part of the appropriations process quite a long time ago, the part

of the process requiring the other body and the administration has not been completed yet, although we are getting very close. We moved out two more bills today, as my colleagues will remember.

This CR does two things: One, it extends the date from midnight tomorrow night until midnight Wednesday night of next week. In addition, because we are reaching the end of the month, it is necessary that we make provision for funding authority for checks that go out automatically every month to those who are in entitlement programs. The agencies involved need to have the authority to go ahead and print the checks, mail the checks, and have them in the mail so that they arrive by the first of the month. Those are the two things this continuing resolution does.

Hopefully, this is the last one we will have to do. One of the outstanding bills is the bill from Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. We are having another meeting this afternoon on this bill with the White House and with the Republican and Democratic Members representing the House and the Senate, and we hope to finalize those agreements today.

The District of Columbia bill, as most Members know, is ready to file, however, it is being held because it may be needed as a vehicle for another appropriations bill that our colleagues in the other body have not passed yet. So there is somewhat of a delay there. It is not a delay of the making of the House of Representatives or the House appropriators.

And I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, as I have said so many times, that the House Committee on Appropriations completed its work very early in the year. We had all 13 of our appropriation bills through the House, with the last one on the floor in July before the August recess. That bill was then withdrawn from consideration and put off, but the appropriators were ready to move.

Anyway, we are near the end. It was theoretically possible that we could have done what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) wanted and made this CR go to midnight on Monday night. Because it runs until Wednesday, he opposed the previous question so that he could offer an amendment to take us to midnight Monday. But, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will not be in session out of respect for the Governor of Missouri who was, along with his son, unfortunately killed in a tragic airplane crash. We respect that and the fact that many of our Members will be traveling to Missouri for that funeral tomorrow.

□ 1545

So there will be no business here tomorrow. Saturday and Sunday the House will not meet for recorded votes. Monday the House will not be in for recorded votes. And so, if we go to the policy of having CR's one day at a